

Operator Analysis for the Higgs Potential and Cosmological Bound on the Higgs-boson Mass [†]

Xinmin Zhang

Center for Theoretical Physics

Department of Physics

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

Abstract

Using effective field theory at finite temperature, we examine the impacts of new physics on the electroweak phase transition. By analysing the high dimensional operators relevant to the Higgs potential we point out that the Higgs mass bound obtained by avoiding the washout of the baryon asymmetry can be relaxed to the region allowed by experiments, provided that new physics appears at the TeV scale.

[†] Work supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation

It is generally realized that baryogenesis at electroweak scale requires new physics beyond the standard model since CP violation in the standard model is too small to yield anything like the observed asymmetry. Furthermore, in the standard model the upper limit of the Higgs mass obtained by avoiding washout of the asymmetry produced during phase transition lies below the present experimental lower bound. In dealing with the CP problem, one possibility to yield sufficient CP violation is to add high dimensional operators to the standard model lagrangian[F.1]. Generally there are two operators in the lowest dimension:

$$O_1 = \frac{\phi^2}{\Lambda^2} Tr W_{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}^{\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (1)$$

$$O_2 = \frac{\phi^2}{\Lambda^2} Tr G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (2)$$

where ϕ is the neutral component of the Higgs doublet H, which develops a vacuum expectation value ($v \simeq 250 GeV$), $G_{\mu\nu}$ and $W_{\mu\nu}$ are the field strength of the $SU(3)_c$ and $SU(2)_L$, respectively. The operator O_1 has been examined in Ref.[5] and O_2 in Ref.[7] with simple replacement of the singlet field by ϕ^2 . The results show that the observed baryon asymmetry can be produced at weak scale provided that the new physics scale Λ is of O(TeV). Moreover, the predicted values of the electric dipole moments of neutron and electron are very close to the experimental limits[8]. This approach to electroweak

[F.1] Other possibilities have also been suggested such as axion models[1], the singlet majoron models[2], the two-Higgs models[3], the SUSY models[4][5] and left-right symmetric models[6].

baryogenesis is based on the effective lagrangian method[F.2], namely the effects of new physics being accounted for by adding to the standard model lagrangian a set of local operators.

In this brief report we discuss the constraints on the Higgs mass and the new physics scale due to electroweak baryogenesis. We will show that the problem of baryon washout can be solved in the same way as the solution of the problem of sufficient CP violation. First of all, let us collect some formulas, with which the cosmological Higgs mass bound is derived in the one-Higgs model.

(a). Baryon number violation rate: The rate of baryon number violation per unit volume in the broken phase can be estimated using the formula[10]

$$\Gamma = \kappa T^4 \left(\frac{\alpha_W}{4\pi} \right)^4 N_{rot} N_{tr} \left(\frac{2M_W(T)}{\alpha_W T} \right)^7 \exp\left(-\frac{E_{sph}(T)}{T}\right), \quad (3)$$

where κ is the numerical factor, N_{tr} and N_{rot} the zero mode factors, estimated in Ref.[10]. The factor $E_{sph}(T)$ is the mass of the sphaleron[11]

$$E_{sph}(T) = \frac{2M_W(T)}{\alpha_W} A\left(\frac{\lambda}{g^2}\right), \quad (4)$$

where $1.5 < A < 2.7$ for $0 \leq \frac{\lambda}{g^2} < \infty$. For the light Higgs mass we are using, A is very close to 1.5.

[F.2] An example of the use of effective lagrangian to consider the effects of new physics on electroweak parameters measured at LEP and in low energy experiments can be found in Ref.[9], where it is generally assumed that the particle spectrum at low energies is that of the standard model and new physics preserves baryon and lepton symmetry.

(b). Effective potential: The temperature dependent gauge boson mass, $M_W(T) = \frac{1}{2}g\phi(T)$, is determined by the effective potential, which can be expressed in the large temperature limit as follows[12]:

$$V_T^{eff} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\phi^2 - ET\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda_T}{4}\phi^4, \quad (5)$$

where

$$D = \frac{1}{8v^2}(2M_W^2 + 2m_t^2 + M_Z^2) \ ;$$

$$T_0^2 = \frac{1}{D}\left(\frac{m_H^2}{4} - 2Bv^2\right) \ ;$$

$$B = \frac{3}{64\pi^2v^4}(2M_W^4 + M_Z^4 - 4m_t^4) \ ;$$

$$E = \frac{1}{6\pi v^3}(2M_W^3 + M_Z^3) \ ;$$

$$\lambda_T = \lambda - \frac{3}{16\pi^2v^4}\left(2M_W^4 \ln \frac{M_W^2}{\alpha_B T^2} + M_Z^4 \ln \frac{M_Z^2}{\alpha_B T^2} - 4m_t^4 \ln \frac{m_t^2}{\alpha_F T^2}\right) \ ,$$

where $\ln \alpha_B = 2 \ln 4\pi - 2\gamma \simeq 3.91$ and $\ln \alpha_F = 2 \ln \pi - 2\gamma \simeq 1.14$.

(c). Higgs mass bound: In the broken phase, the vacuum expectation value, $\phi(T) \sim E/\lambda_T$, should be big enough to suppress the sphaleron rate[13]. For the one-doublet Higgs theory, one has approximately $m_H = (2\lambda)^{1/2}v < 35\text{GeV}$ [12].

Now we discuss the corrections of new physics to each of the above aspects:

(a’). Corrections to baryon number violation rate: Since there is still one-doublet Higgs field in the effective theory, we think that with Higgs mass in the range of 100 GeV (see below), “deformed sphaleron” is irrelevant to the calculation of sphaleron rate [F.3]. So the effect of high dimensional operators is to modify the coefficient $A(\lambda/g^2)$ in eq.(4), but the effect is generally suppressed by powers of Λ .

(b’). Corrections to the effective potential: The effect of new physics is to add some high dimensional operators, constructed out of Higgs field without derivatives, to the effective potential (5). The first paper of Ref.[9] has classified almost all of the possible operators. From their list, we find one operator in the lowest dimension:

$$O_3 = \alpha \frac{\phi^6}{\Lambda^2} , \tag{6}$$

where α is a free parameter, calculated by matching the effective theory with the underlying theory. If we simply add this operator to the effective potential (5), it violates the renormalization conditions used in Refs.[12][16] to calculate the effective potential (5), namely, O_3 shifts the vacuum expectation value and Higgs mass away from that derived from the Higgs potential (5). In fact if we fix the vacuum expectation value as it should be, the effects of O_3

[F.3] The arguments here are presented in paper[14]. In the one-doublet Higgs model, “deformed sphaleron”[15] can emerge only for $m_H > 12M_W$, which is not physically interesting based on triviality arguments.

are renormalizing the Higgs self-couplings. Following this line of argument, we redefine a renormalized O_3 by imposing renormalization conditions[12][16] that preserve the tree level value of v and $m_H^2 = 2\lambda v^2$ at $\phi = v$. Denoting the renormalized O_3 by

$$V_3^{(r)} = O_3 + \text{counterterms} \quad (7)$$

where $\text{counterterms} = a v^2 \phi^2 + b \phi^4$ with $a, b \sim O(v^2/\Lambda^2)$, using renormalization conditions [12][16]

$$\text{i) } \left. \frac{d}{d\phi} V_3^{(r)} \right|_{\phi=v} = 0 ,$$

$$\text{ii) } \left. \frac{d^2}{d\phi^2} V_3^{(r)} \right|_{\phi=v} = 0 ,$$

we get

$$V_3^{(r)} = \alpha \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2} \phi^2 \left(-\phi^2 + v^2 + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\phi^4}{v^2} \right) . \quad (8)$$

There should be two more operators which are not in the list of Ref[9].

They are:

$$O_4 = \beta \frac{\phi^6}{\Lambda^2} \ln \frac{\phi^2}{v^2} , \quad (9)$$

$$O_5 = \delta T \cdot \phi^3 \cdot \frac{\phi^2}{\Lambda^2} ,$$

where β and δ are calculable parameters. The similarity of these two operators to O_3 is that all of them are suppressed by Λ^2 , so they are effects of new physics. The differences are that, unlike O_3 , O_4 is not analytic in ϕ and O_5 is very similar to the cubic term in (5). It can be easily proven that these

two operators are generated by loops of light particles from high dimensional operators.

Since O_4 and O_5 are doubly suppressed by loop factors and Λ^2 , practically we can neglect them. So the important correction of new physics to effective potential is due to $V_3^{(r)}$.

(c'). Corrections to the Higgs mass bound: When combined with the discussions above, we conclude that the most important effect of new physics on the Higgs mass bound is shifting λ_T in (5) to $\lambda_T - 4\alpha \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2}$. Consequently,

$$m_H^2 < (35 \text{ GeV})^2 + 8\alpha \frac{v^4}{\Lambda^2} . \quad (10)$$

Clearly, we should take α positive. Taking $\alpha = 1$, we see that the Higgs mass can be relaxed to around 100 GeV if Λ is of O(TeV). For examples, taking Λ to be 3.6TeV, 2.5TeV and 1.9TeV, we get $M_H < 60\text{GeV}$, 80GeV and 100GeV respectively.

In conclusion, we have considered the operator- analysis for electroweak phase transition. Our results show that electroweak baryogenesis is possible provided that new physics is in the TeV range. However, it should be pointed out that Λ cannot be too small, otherwise $V_3^{(r)}$ will destroy vacuum stability at zero temperature, since it increases the true vacuum energy relative to the false vacuum energy. As an example, taking $m_t = 150\text{GeV}$ and $m_H = 100\text{GeV}$, we find that Λ cannot be lower than about 1 TeV. Certainly, if Λ is too small, our effective lagrangian becomes unreliable. Instead, we should work on the underlying theory.

We should also mention that the mechanism for relaxing the Higgs mass

bound proposed here is the same as that of Hall and Anderson[16]; however, the models used are quite different. In Ref.[16], explicit gauge singlet fields with invariant bare masses are used, and in the large mass limit a operator similar to $V_3^{(r)}$ is also obtained. This is understandable, since the effective operator O_3 should be the loop effects of heavy particles, which include the singlet scalars used in Ref.[16]. The method used in this paper is more general, and it is consistent with the approach to electroweak baryogenesis used in Refs.[5][7]. It should be pointed out that in our discussions we have neglected the effect of the running coupling constants from Λ down to T . This will give rise to some uncertainties in the determination of m_H and Λ . However, this uncertainty may not be bigger than that due to the well-known uncertainties in the B-violation rates.

I would like to thank R.N. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov for discussions, and S. Lee, B-L Young for discussing the properties associated with sphalerons in effective lagrangian.

References

- [1] L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 1075 (1989); V. A. Kuzmin, M. E. Shaposhnikov and I.I. Tkachev, Phys. Rev. **45D**, 466 (1992).
- [2] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **245B**, 561 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **349B**, 727 (1991).

- [3] N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. **V65**, 2331 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **B358**, 471 (1991); L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov, N. Turok and M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. **256B**, 451 (1991).
- [4] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **263B**, 86 (1991); A.E. Nelson, D.B. Kaplan and A.G. Cohen, Nucl. Phys. **373B**, 453 (1992).
- [5] M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. **257B**, 351 (1991).
- [6] R.N. Mohapatra and X. Zhang, Maryland preprint UMDHEP 92-230 (1992) To appear in Phys. Rev. D.
- [7] R.N. Mohapatra and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **45D**, 2699 (1992).
- [8] X. Zhang, Maryland preprint UMDHEP 93-07, July 1992.
- [9] For examples, see W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, Nucl. Phys. **268B**, 621 (1986); B. Grinstein and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **265B**, 326 (1991); A. de Rújula, B. Gavela, O. Peñe and F.J. Vegas, Nucl. Phys. **357B**, 311 (1990).
- [10] P. Arnold and L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. **36D**, 581 (1987); L. Carson, Xu Li, L. McLerran and R.T. Wang, Phys. Rev. **42D**, 2127 (1990).
- [11] F.R. Klinkhamer and N.S. Manton, Phys. Rev. **30D**, 2212 (1984).
- [12] M. Dine, R. Leigh, P. Huet, A. Linde and D. Linde, Stanford university preprint SU-ITP-92-7 (1992) and references therein.
- [13] M.E. Shaposhnikov, JETP Lett. **44**, 465 (1986); A.I. Bochkarev, S. Yu. Khlebnikov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **329B**, 493 (1990), M. Dine, P. Huet and R. Singleton, Nucl. Phys. **375B**, 625 (1992); B.H.

- Liu, L. McLerran and N. Turok, TPI-MINN-92/18-T, April 1992.
- [14] B. Kastening, R.D. Peccei and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. **266B**, 413 (1991).
- [15] L.G. Yaffe, Phys. Rev. **D40**, 3463 (1989); J. Kunz and Y. Brihaye, Phys. Lett. **B216**, 353 (1989); F.R. Klinkhamer, Phys. Lett. **B236**, 187 (1990).
- [16] G. Anderson and L. Hall, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2685 (1992).